

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, August 23, 2012 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

**Present:** Chairman Steve Fewell, Supervisors Tom De Wane, Tim Carpenter  
**Excused:** Supervisor Steffen  
**Also Present:** Supervisors Moynihan and Robinson, Troy Streckenbach, Brent Miller, David Hjalquist, Lynn Vanden Langenberg, Kristen Hooker, Rob Strong, Robyn Hallet; Randy Gast; Jon Syndergarrd; other interested parties

---

### **I. Call to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Fewell at 5:00 p.m.

### **II. Approve/Modify Agenda.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve the agenda with the addition of Items 1a-d. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **III. Election of Vice-Chair.**

*This item was held until the arrival of Supervisor Carpenter.*

Supervisor De Wane nominated Supervisor Carpenter as Vice Chair of the Administration Committee. Supervisor Carpenter accepted this nomination.

### **IV. Approve/Modify Minutes of July 26, 2012.**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### **Communications**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to take items 1 and 1a together. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

*Supervisor Carpenter arrived at 5:02 pm*

1. Communication from Supervisor Robinson, Erickson and Fewell re: If the BC Housing Authority continues on the path of transferring management, we request that they do an RFP before awarding the contract, stating their reasons for seeking a new vendor. *Referred from August County Board.*

### **Communication from Chair Fewell**

- 1a. To formally request that the Brown County Housing Authority do the following:
  - a. Extend the contract to Integrated Community Services for the year 2013 to avoid a disruption in service to the many clients of the section eight housing voucher program.
  - b. To complete an independent review of the section eight housing voucher program by the end of the first quarter of 2013.

- c. **After completing the independent review consider the options available, including a plan of correction, re-negotiating the contract with ICS, and/or consider if a RFP process is even necessary.**
- d. **These steps would assure the stability of the Brown County Section Eight housing voucher program through 2013, it would also allow for the appropriate evaluation to be completed, and give adequate time for a successful transition if needed by January 1, 2014.**

Supervisor Robinson informed that this communication was brought in connection with learning about the decision by the Brown County Housing Authority (BCHA) to not renew the contract for their grant programs with ICS. Robinson is hopeful that tonight's meeting will provide an update as to the current status of the decision as to whether or not the BCHA will be contracting with ICS and secondly, what the reasons were for not continuing with ICS.

Housing Administrator Robyn Hallet introduced herself and also introduced Executive Director Rob Strong and Commissioner Ann Hartman to the Committee. Hartman stated that she has been on the Housing Authority for about a year and had recently attended training where she learned that as a Commissioner she is responsible for this very elaborate program and she also learned that there are many other Authorities throughout the state that are in trouble due to poor decisions. She was very impressed with the others on the Commission and felt that they have made very good decisions and she has great confidence in the Commissioners.

Hallet understood that the reason they were there was to explain the process on how they made their decision. The request was that they have an independent review done and they did do this. This is not a decision that was made hastily. Staff began looking at this in April knowing that the contract with ICS would be up in December and they knew they would need many months to take the proper steps depending on what decision was made. They began early to determine what would have to be completed to accomplish this and then as staff they brought that information to their Board and brought them up to speed so an appropriate decision could be made.

Hallet continued that in 2006 the Housing Authority decided to enter into a contract and it went out for a RFP. ICS was one of the two proposals submitted. At that time there was the idea of handling the program in-house but there was not enough time to get it done so the idea was not pursued any further. This is something that has been on the Housing Authority's mind for a number of years. Knowing that the contract was coming to an end, they made the decision to explore this more thoroughly.

Hallet stated that they had determined there were four options as follows: 1) extend the existing contract with ICS; 2) seek proposals for a new contractor; 3) renegotiate the contract with ICS or 4) assume direct management of the program. With regard to the first option of extending the existing contract, there have been some concerns with the current management and they felt that now is the time to make any desired changes to the program with the contract coming to an end and therefore, they have ruled out the option of extending the existing contract.

With regard to the second option of a new RFP, back in 2006 when that was done, there was a lot of time and effort involved in the RFP process and it did not yield very significant results. There were 16 proposals sent out and only two came back and she noted that there are not many companies that do this type of work.

One of the major concerns with the third option of renegotiating the contract is that by the very nature of a third party contract, they are losing some of the control and this is a program that the Board of Commissioners is solely responsible for and they need to have a full understanding and full grasp on how the program operates. They felt that the best way to achieve this was to take the program in-house and this is the reason they decided not to renegotiate a contract with ICS and instead go with the fourth option of taking the program in-house. Hallet stated they looked at this step by step and the first step was to look at a financial analysis to be sure this is

an appropriate option and this showed that they could realize a cost savings by doing it in-house. They then began pursuing some of the details further making sure that all of the concerns with the current management system would be alleviated or reduced by doing this in-house. They also finalized any other expenses on the financial analysis that they did not have information for and they did a study of the necessary staffing positions and explored the concept of hiring a consultant to oversee the process.

Chair Fewell questioned if the process was that Green Bay would take the program over in-house and Hallet answered that initially they anticipated the staff that would administer the program would be employees of the City. However, after further thought and discussions they realized that that would not be well received. Fewell asked where they are at this time and Hallet responded that they are in the process of determining which direction they need to go. She continued that the Housing Authority has made the decision to take it in-house and that decision still stands, but they continue to explore what their staffing options are and they have not reached a decision as to that at this time. Rob Strong elaborated that at the last meeting of the Housing Authority a subcommittee was appointed to look at the remaining options for taking the program in-house and they will also be meeting with ICS to talk about how to transition this.

Fewell informed that the County Board takes this very seriously and he felt that ultimately Brown County has oversight and responsibility for this. Hallet stated that their understanding is that the responsibility falls on the five Commissioners. Strong stated that although he cannot get into a lot of details, he wanted the Committee to know that this was a business decision for the future of a \$14 million dollar program that a board of five people are responsible for. It has nothing to do with personalities and nothing to do with any other things that may be rumored. The BCHA meets with the ICS staff monthly and this has been done for 40 years. Strong wanted to be sure the Committee knew that they feel that the best future of the program is to have it administered by the BCHA where they have control over everything. He noted that with budget cutbacks there are challenges in keeping the program operating and noted that there are about 3200 people receiving assistance under this program and they want to be sure that this continues in the future in a manner where they are not concerned about the ability to carry the program forward.

Robinson thanked Hallet, Strong and Hartman for attending the meeting and providing information. Robinson referred to Hartman's earlier comment that the program as it exists now is in good shape and he felt that this indicates that the performance of ICS is not the issue and the issue seemed to be more a cost decision. Strong stated that cost was a piece of it and reiterated that Hallet informed the Committee that the Authority would not take it over if it cost more money to run the program. He continued that this year the program was \$160,000 under budget. Strong does not want to make it sound like ICS has not done a good job of managing the program because that is not what they are talking about. The decision has to do with the future of the program and the BCHA's ability to have a comfort level that this program is going to go into the future without problems. Robinson acknowledged that this is a complex situation, but because it is a publicly funded program he would like to get some sense of why it was decided to go in-house and he said it sounded like it was a combination of some financial issues and ability to do the work in the future. Strong agreed that that was a fair statement. Robinson asked if concerns were communicated to ICS about them being able to adapt to future needs. Hallet stated that they did not tell ICS of their thoughts early on because they needed to get their facts straight before they presented this to ICS. Robinson asked if it was correct that the reasons for the decision and the concerns were not shared with ICS prior to the decision being communicated and Hallet said that that was correct. Robinson stated that he had real concerns with this and said it does not sound like the type of action that should be taken to address concerns, especially if the program had been well administered up to this point.

Supervisor DeWane felt that in order to really get into the specifics another meeting should be held in closed session. He continued that the Housing Authority is their own entity. Brown County just has appointees and that is the extent of the County involvement. Robinson acknowledged that there may be better venues for

further discussions, but he also felt that it was important to try to get out as much information as possible and as appropriate into the public venue. Supervisor Moynihan did not understand the need for closed session and felt that decisions are not based on innuendo and he did not understand the rationale behind making a very public decision behind closed doors.

Robinson clarified that the BCHA hired Strong and Hallet and they both work-full time for Green Bay. Strong and Hallet confirmed this. Robinson asked if the BCHA had hired other staff members and Hallet answered that they had a senior accountant as well as an intern, both of whom are employees of the City. Strong continued that this is a significant transition and they are looking at bringing over as many employees from ICS as possible as they did not want to see people lose jobs because of this. They felt the easiest way to do this was to bring them into an established system with a personnel office, personnel policies, retirement benefits, etc.

Fewell stated that his concerns are outlined in his communication and he continued that the Board is concerned with the integrity of the program and keeping the program going. He continued that it seemed like staff had the idea that they were going to be able to hold this all in and work it under Green Bay. He continued that this is a Brown County program and his concern is that if this is done in-house that there can't be an independent review. Fewell stated there was concern about the fact that all five Commissioners live in the City of Green Bay and not one of them live in the outlying areas of the County. The two people overseeing the program are City employees and there are County Board members that feel that there is no independence. Fewell also had concerns of transitioning a \$14 million dollar program in a matter of a couple months. He felt the best option was to come up with an acceptable timeframe that allows time for an evaluation to be sure financially this is a good move even if it means having to extend the contract for another year.

Hallet agreed with Fewell and acknowledged that this is a complicated program and is not something that another entity can take over with short notice. When the Housing Authority was discussing this the first time in closed session there was still enough time but there were details to be worked out to be sure it was feasible. It was just recently determined that it was not going to work to go through the City and she agreed that time is now running short. Strong reiterated that a subcommittee had been set up to work on this. He said that some members of the Commission are also concerned with the timeframe. This subcommittee will continue to work on this and Strong assured that this will be handled appropriately. They will continue to look at options and stated that the motion that had been approved was to take this in-house by the first of the year. Strong did not expect everyone to be happy with this situation because it does impact people's lives, both those on the program and those who work at ICS.

Robinson felt that the idea of extending the contract for a year and doing an independent review was an excellent idea in light of the fact that this is coming down to the point where the transition may not be able to be made. He agreed there is concern that all of the Commissioners and staff are Green Bay residents. He did feel that each person was approaching this with a good heart and good intelligence, but as a collective whole there are concerns. Strong stated that he does not get paid to be the Executive Director of the Housing Authority by the Housing Authority and Robyn will also not be paid anymore if this goes through. Strong stated that what this is about is the security of the program. He also stated that they had met with ICS the day after the BCHA made their decision to let them know right away of the changes and at that time they told ICS that they wanted to meet with staff immediately to let them know there would be jobs out there although they did not know how it would be structured. They also had a follow-up meeting to answer questions and explain why this decision was made. Additionally, they advised staff what the City could offer as far as pay structure and that if everything went smoothly this is how it would move forward, however it did not go smoothly.

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Randy Gast, Board Chairman Integrated Community Services, Inc.**

Gast introduced himself as the Board Chairman of ICS and stated he has been associated with this organization for about 15 years including as Board Chairman for the last 10 years. He appreciated the Committee's involvement in assessing this situation and looking for additional information. He stated that this is a very significant County program with many, many families involved.

Gast stated that they were very surprised in July when they learned that they no longer have the contract at the end of the year. They have had a 40 year relationship with this program. This program started as a test with some funding from HUD to see if a private non-profit entity could run these program more efficiently than government could. He stated that ICS is consistently awarded recognition by HUD as high performers in the field and in the last 30 months they have run the program \$268,000 under the federal budget allocated to run the program. They are a very lean and efficient organization and are able to react in ways that they don't think that governmental entities can. He stated that they are a valuable non-profit corporation in the community and this program is their foundation. They also have a number of collateral programs to reach their goal of moving people from dependence on these programs to independence.

Gast continued that they are very fearful as an organization that if the contract goes away, their foundation will go away and the ancillary programs that benefit the community will also go away. He felt they do a good job with the programs and nobody has said that they do not. Another part of the shock and dismay was that nobody contacted them to discuss this. He stated that nobody has ever told them of any concerns they had to give them any opportunity to do things differently. He also stated they have office space, business leases and equipment leases in place to run the program. If this contract goes away, they may not be able to fulfill their financial commitments on these things. If there are programmatic concerns, ICS would be happy to address them and they are hopeful that they can negotiate and continue the contract.

Supervisor Carpenter thanked Gast for attending the meeting and providing information. He asked Gast why he felt the Housing Authority made the decision to not extend the contract in light of the fact that they have operated under budget and have not had any complaints. Gast responded that the only thing he has heard is the control function. Gast stated they have never been issued any sort of default notice under the contract and have never been told they are doing anything wrong. Gast felt that they had a good relationship of mutual respect and professionalism with the BCHA over the last 40 years.

De Wane asked Assistant Corporation Counsel Kristen Hooker what authority the Administration Committee has in this matter. Hooker stated that the Committee would have authority to make appointments as well as dissolving it all together. De Wane urged Strong to take a good look at this and felt that that perhaps more information was needed as it did not sound that Mr. Gast understood why the decision was made. Strong stated that the subcommittee that will be looking at this will also be meeting with the County Executive and Chair Moynihan. After that meeting is held they will hold a meeting with ICS. Strong also defended his Board and stated that they have bankers, business people, real estate people and neighborhood people on the Board. He defended his Commissioners and said that the Administration Committee has done a good job in appointing good people.

**Jon Syndergaard, President/CEO of Integrated Community Services, Inc.**

Syndergaard introduced himself to the Committee and stated one of the things that he felt has become abundantly clear based on feedback they had received is that there may be some current concern about ICS and their viability going forward. In response to that, he would remind the Committee that they have been around for 40 years and financially they are a very successful organization. Their balance sheet is as strong as ever with

the exception of some debt for some recent acquisitions and their cash position is also as strong as its ever been. This allows them to diversify and allocate their costs successfully away from programs like the housing choice voucher program so it becomes inherently more affordable and efficient for the County and the taxpayers. If there are concerns regarding the ICS balance sheet or viability, he would be very happy and interested to facilitate a meeting with their accountants and banking representatives to discuss this further.

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Fewell stated the concern was the lack of time and transition at this point. He felt their concern was to send a recommendation to the BCHA that stated they needed to do something immediately to stabilize the situation which would be to extend the contract for one year and go through the review process and create a strategic timeline on how they were going to transition, if that was indeed what they chose to do.

**Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to have Corporation Counsel put their recommendation in resolution form and let the Executive Committee handle it. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### Treasurer

##### 2. Budget Status Financial Reports for June and July, 2012.

Treasurer Kerry Blaney indicated that delinquencies have been going up over the last several years due to the economic times. The County receives interest and penalties on these delinquencies because they eventually have to be paid through the foreclosure process. Delinquencies are now decreasing and therefore interest and penalties are also down and this has made it difficult to meet the projected revenue. Blaney did note, however, that their expenditures are under budget.

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

##### 3. Treasurer's Financial Report for the Months of May and June, 2012.

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### Information Services

##### 4. Budget Status Financial Report for June, 2012.

##### 5. Director's Report.

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file Items 4 and 5. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### Human Resources

##### 6. Budget Status Financial Report for June, 2012.

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane , seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. **Activity Report for July, 2012.**

Fewell questioned why Human Resources was not advertising to fill positions at the 911 Center. Interim HR Manager Lynn Vanden Langenberg stated that when the posting was put out they had over 300 applications and they were moving through the process. She continued that the problem with keeping the positions posted is that they cannot keep up in the processing of the applications. They do plan to do another posting around September 1.

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Department of Administration**

8. **Budget Status Financial Report for June, 2012.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

9. **Countywide Financial Analysis as of June, 2012.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor De Wane to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. **2012 Budget Adjustment Log.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Carpenter, seconded by Supervisor DeWane to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

11. **June 30, 2012 Vehicle Listing.**

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

12. **Review of Purchasing Policy. *Held for one month.***

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

13. **Director's Report.**

**Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Corporation Counsel**

14. **Closed Session: Pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 19.85(1)(e) for the purpose of deliberating or negotiating the purchase of public properties, the investing of public funds, or conducting other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session; and pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved. (Getmor Enterprises, LLC vs. Brown County, Case No. 12-C-633 Litigation)**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to enter into closed session at 6:35 p.m.

Roll Call: Present: De Wane, Carpenter, Fewell

Excused: Steffen

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to return to regular order of business at approximately 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Present: De Wane, Carpenter, Fewell

Excused: Steffen

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Other**

15. Audit of bills.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to pay the bills. Vote taken.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

16. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Motion made by Supervisor De Wane, seconded by Supervisor Carpenter to adjourn at approximately 7:05 p.m. Vote taken. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein  
Recording Secretary